

II. Amendments to the Drawings

The examiner objected to the drawings because Figures 2-4 do not physically label (name) components marked by numbers. Accordingly, replacement sheets 2-4 are provided containing amended Figures 2-4.

III. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 3-30 and 32-39 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The applicant acknowledges the examiner's indication that claims 17-30 are allowed.

Claims 4-9 and 32-35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 has been amended so as to be in independent form, including the subject matter of its base claims that was noted by the examiner as allowable.

Claim 32 has also been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 10-11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,686,911 to Levin et al. (Levin).

Claims 31, and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,920,479 to McDowall et al. (McDowall).

Claims 1, 2, and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 10, 11, and 14 have been amended to depend from claim 4 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 4. Claims 36-39 have been amended to depend from claim 32 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons given above in support of claim 32. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12-13, and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin '911 in view of McDowall '479.

Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 have been amended to depend from claim 4 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 4. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.


Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of

record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: February 28, 2006



Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000